

The Office Action requests that a “listing of all claims readable thereon” the elected species be provided and further states that “none of the claims are generic.” Applicant notes that the Office Action identifies two species, the first, “a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device” as set forth in the preceding paragraph, and the second, which is identified as “a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device including the steps of disposing a mass of conductive material in a cavity between two secured semiconductor components and altering the mass of conductive material within said cavity to form at least one interconnect element.” (Office Action at page 2).

Independent claim 1, with claims 2 through 38 dependent therefrom, is directed to a “method for electrically connecting semiconductor component substrates,” that includes the act of “injecting a flowable conductive material into the at least one interconnect void.” These claims thus correspond to the first species identified in the Office Action and elected herein.

Independent claim 39, with claims 40 through 51 dependent therefrom, is directed to a “method for electrically connecting semiconductor component substrates,” that includes the acts of “disposing a mass of conductive material in the at least one cavity” and “altering the mass of conductive material to a flowable state to form at least one conductive interconnect structure within the at least one interconnect void extending between the at least one interconnect element and the at least another interconnect element.” These claims thus correspond to the second species identified in the Office Action.

However, independent claim 52, with claims 53 through 59 dependent therefrom, is not directed to “method for electrically connecting semiconductor component substrates.” Instead, it is directed to a “semiconductor component assembly.” The undersigned counsel has attempted multiple times to contact the Examiner to discuss this situation, but has received no response to any voice mail messages. Based upon the elements of these claims, applicant respectfully submits that claims 52 through 59 are not properly characterized in either the first or second species, as claims 52 through 59 are directed to an apparatus. Clarification as to the status of claims 52 through 59 in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Please Note Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant wishes to draw the Examiner's attention to the Information Disclosure Statement filed with the Office on September 19, 2003, and respectfully request that the documents or other information referenced therein be made of record in the present application and that an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form be returned to the undersigned attorney evidencing the same.

Should any of the documents, or portions thereof, be unavailable to the Examiner for any reason, please contact the undersigned attorney, who will supply same immediately by facsimile or other suitable method of delivery.

Applicant requests an action on the merits of claims 1 through 38 and 52 through 59.

Respectfully submitted,



Bretton L. Crockett
Registration No. 44,632
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: October 1, 2004

BLC/nj:sd